



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,694	01/02/2004	Robert DeSantis	IBMP014/SVL9/20040508US1	3817
63056 7590 06/20/2008 MOLLBORN PATENTS, INC. ATTN: IBM 2840 COLBY DRIVE BOULDER, CO 80305				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, PHILLIP H				
ART UNIT 2191		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/20/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MOLLBORN@MOLLBORN.COM
sbailey@mollborn.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,694

Applicant(s)

DESANTIS, ROBERT

Examiner

Phillip H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 3/27/2008.
2. Per applicant's request, claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended; claim 20 has been cancelled.
3. Claims 1-19 remain pending and have been considered below.

Response to Amendment

4. The rejection to claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to cancel claim 20.
5. The rejection to claims 1-13, 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/2008 regarding 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant asserts on page 8 of the amendment regarding claims 1 and 17 that Chan fails to teach *generation of different proxies for different clients, or restrictions for certain clients to access only certain beans/methods*.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the allegation as argued. Chan teaches "*It is also an object of the invention to provide a code generation tool that takes a bean, a*

*software component containing only **application domains specific logic**, and **generate appropriate middleware proxies** for use of the bean in a distributed application"* (see col. 3:25-30). In other words, the proxies are specific or unique to the client-side data processing system.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1] Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation. During patent examining, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

Applicant always has opportunities to amend the claims during the prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduce the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (USPN 6,230,160), in view of Burd et al. (USPN 6,990,653).

As per claims 1, 17, and 20:

Chan teaches:

creating a session-specific Application Program Interface on the server side for a server-side software method (see at least col. 5, lines 53-54 "***The code generation makes use of the Java Introspection APIs to query interface information of the server bean***"); and

automatically creating an interpreted script language program that is unique to the client-side data processing system and contains calls to the server-side software method in accordance with the session-specific Application Program Interface (see at least col. 5, lines 38-48 "***a code generation tool implemented for a Java programming environment is provide to generate all necessary "interface" to permit a distributed application to be created...The output is a number of proxy classes which permit the local listening and event firing activities, as well as method invocation, between the client and server beans to emulated over a distributed environment***"; see also at least col. 5, lines 56-58 "***the code generation generates 1. a client-side-server-proxy...***"; also see col. 8, lines 10-13 "***Using a code generator, the client-side-server proxy 110 on the client machine 100 side has been generated for execution in any Java execution environment that provides the RMI services***").

Chan does not explicitly teach:

sending the created interpreted script language program to the client side data processing system.

However, Burd teaches:

sending the created interpreted script language program to the client side data processing system (see at least col. 2, lines 1-4 "**server-side application program may generate HTML code using a sequence of one or more formatted text write operations to a memory structure. Thereafter, the resulting text is transmitted to a client system in a HTTP response, wherein it is displayed in the browser**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chan's approach to allow the client-side-server-proxy to be created at the server and transmitted to client to reduce the programming requirement at client. One would have been motivated to modify to allow creating proxy code at the server and transferring to client to reduce or minimize the programming requirements of the client-side-server-proxy.

As per claim 2:

Chan further teaches:

executing the interpreted script language program on the client side to call the server-side software method (see col. 8, lines 10-13 "**Using a code generator, the client-side-server proxy 110 on the client machine 100 side has been generated for execution in any Java execution environment that provides the RMI services**").

Art Unit: 2191

As per claim 3:

Chan further teaches:

wherein executing the interpreted script language program includes creating a programming language object having the same name as a server-side programming language bean (see at least col. 6, lines 51-53 "**Once the client-side-server proxy has been generated and used to created the Java client program or beans...**").

As per claim 4:

Chan further teaches:

wherein the interpreted script language program is executed by a non-modified standard browser program (see at least **FIG. 3A**; also see at least col. 7, line 55 "**The form of the client machine 100 is a browser environment 102 that permits Internet access**").

As per claims 5-7:

Chan further teaches:

initially registering the server-side method on the server side, wherein the registering includes identifying includes identifying the registered server-side methods (see at least col. 7, lines 9-15 "**In order for a client bean to register its interest in an event of a remote server bean event, the client bean registers itself as a listener of the events with the client-side-server-proxy.**").

The client-side-server-proxy delegates this interest to the server bean via the server-side-server-proxy. This causes the server-side-server-proxy to become a registered listener for the event in the server bean..."; see also at least FIG. 2).

As per claim 8:

Chan in combination with Burd teach all the limitations of the base claim as outlined above. Furthermore, Chan in combination with further teach:

wherein registration is performed using Server Page tags (see Burd at least col. 2, lines 25-27 ***"The ASP file contains declarations or tags that perform various functions..."***).

As per claims 9 and 10:

Chan further teaches:

wherein the session-specific Application Program Interface identifies parameters of the method (see at least col. 5, lines 53-55 ***"The code generator makes use of the Java Introspection APIs to query interface information of the server bean"***).

As per claim 11:

Chan further teaches:

wherein the method is a method in a programming language bean (see at least col. 5, lines 25-26 ***"In creating a distributed application, the user typically wants to access methods and events of a server bean..."***).

As per claims 12 and 18:

Chan further teaches:

wherein executing the interpreted script language program includes converting the parameters sent to the server side (see at least col. 7, lines 17-18 ***"the server-side-server-proxy will be notified and, in turn, the client-side-server-proxy will be passed the event object"***).

As per claims 13 and 19:

Chan further teaches:

wherein executing the interpreted script language program includes converting results sent from the server side (see at least col. 7, lines 20-24 ***"...the event object is streamed, that is copied, from the server-side-server-proxy to the client-side-server-proxy"***).

As per claims 14 and 15:

Chan in combination with Burd teach all the limitations of the base claim as outlined above. Furthermore, Chan in combination with Burd further teach:

using Simple Object Access Protocol calls to invoke the server-side method and return results from the server-side method (see Burd at least col. 13, line 55 "**SOAP**" – *Burd teaches the use of SOAP for data exchange*).

As per claim 16:

Chan further teaches:

declaring public methods for a current session (see at least col. 6, lines 14-22 "***In order to create client-side-server-proxy, the following interface information is analyzed from the server bean and user in producing the client-side-server-proxy and its supporting classes: (i) All public methods provided by the server bean...***"); and

instantiating program objects on the client-side that corresponding to server-side objects (see at least col. 6, lines 14-22 "***...For each public method found in the server bean, an identical method will be found in the client-side-server-proxy...***").

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN

6/13/2008

/Wei Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191